

**Extract of transcript**

**Senator WATERS:** If you think that people should have the right to be able to lodge an objection to either a mining lease or an environmental authority, will you be opposing the current state government's proposals to remove that right to object?

**Mr Singer:** I have to say I am not across that part.

**Senator WATERS:** You are not across that the bill to remove objection rights to projects such as your own?

**Mr Singer:** No, but I could take it on notice.

**Senator WATERS:** Thank you, if you could. If your position is, as you say, that you do think people should have that right—and I think that is the correct position—I am interested in what steps you will take with the current proposals to water that down significantly or entirely removing it in some instances.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** You would think that a decision on what the company might do in relation to government legislation would be a board decision. But perhaps the board may not be interested in getting involved in that.

**Mr Singer:** Following this example, we are on record with the Queensland government as saying that we believe there needs to be some hurdle to entry. Just because somebody writes a letter, it should not be accepted and go in to a full court process.

---

Rio Tinto Alcan notes that the Queensland Resources Council made a written submission in regard to the bill in question. Rio Tinto Alcan supports the Queensland Resources Council submission in this regard, namely

*“QRC wholly supports the amendments in the Bill to streamline notifications and objections that aim to streamline processes but ensuring **genuine concerns** on matters of environment regarding resource projects have a pathway for comment and consideration. QRC believes that the Queensland Government has a role to play in preventing vexatious objections and appeals against what is a resource that belongs to the people of Queensland.”*